

Remarks

Claims 1-42 are pending in this application. The examiner has rejected claims 1-9, 15, 18, 21-30, 36 and 39-40 under § 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,311,223 issued to Bodin et al. Claims 10-14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 31-35, 37-38, and 41-42 stand rejected under §103 (a) as being unpatentably obvious over Bodin.

It is believed the claims as now amended distinguish the present invention over Bodin. With the Bodin process, two completely separate and distinct tokenization processes exist. The first Bodin tokenization process involves tokenizing HMTL tags using a lookup table (See Lookup Table at top of Col. 6). These tag-related tokens are unique to and created for the Bodin process. They are not integrated with the particular compression application used. Bodin, in fact, uses conventional compression techniques. See Col. 6, lines 33-36. As one skilled in the art will recognize, these conventional compression techniques use a second tokenization process. This second process requires the transmission of dictionary information for not only the content information, but also the tags when using the compression application. The transmission of this tag-related dictionary information weighs on compression efficiency.

The process of the present invention is different. It goes beyond the Bodin method by integrating the initial markup language tokenization process with the later compression-related tokenization process. Table A of the original application shows the table used for the initial tokenization of the mark-up language (here, HTML). Table B shows the table used for the later compression-related tokenization process. As can be seen from comparing the tables, the tokens created for the tags in Table A (e.g., on Page 22 “0x105” denotes HTML tag “<A”) are already recognizable within the second tokenization process. Thus, referring now to Huffman compression-token Table B, we see that the tag-related identifier “0x105” is an already

known, recognizable token, which is already associated with a particular binary code. In this case, “11000000100011101001000.” Because the tokens created in the mark-up tokenization process are already defined within the compression application (Huffman coding in the preferred embodiment), there is no need to transmit dictionary information regarding the tag-related tokens to the compression algorithm. This is because these tokens are already recognizable by the compression algorithm. Thus, the tag-related tokens are directly useable by the compression algorithm. This, therefore, reduces the size of the compressed representation of the data in comparison to Bodin. Reducing the size of the data for transmission or storage is the whole purpose of any compression technique. Valuable processing time is also saved in both the encoding and decoding phases. The compression process overall is more efficient.

Because Bodin does not show this integrated tokenization, limitations have been added to the claims to more clearly emphasize this difference between the present invention and Bodin. Bodin fails to show the use of mark-up language tokens which are directly useable by the compression algorithm used as now claimed. Thus, the application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned by telephone prior to issuing a subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mull', followed by a long, horizontal, wavy line that extends to the right.

Marshall S. Honeyman
Reg. No. 48,114

MSH/tjd

SHOOK, HARDY, & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64018-2613
816/474-6550

THE COMMISSIONER IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO
CHARGE ANY ADDITIONAL AMOUNT REQUIRED,
OR CREDIT ANY OVERPAYMENT, TO ACCOUNT
NO. 19-2112.